

Remarks

In the Office Action mailed May 6, 2004:

1. Claim 131 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement;
2. Claim 134 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention;
3. Claims 1, 3, 50, 51, 72, 78, 80-82, 129-130, 132-133 and 135 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hui (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,749), in view of Rogan (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,816);
4. Claims 4-25, 28-31, 33, 34-37, 39-40, 52-71, 83-128 were allowed; and
5. Claims 41-45, 48, 73-77, 79 and 136-140 were objected to.

I. Selected Claims

1. Claims 1, 3, 41-45, 47-50, 51, 129-134

Claims 1 and 51 were amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 41, which was objected to. Claim 41 was cancelled; claims 42-45 were amended to depend from claim 1 vice claim 41.

Claims 131 and 134 were cancelled.

2. Claims 72-82

Claims 72 and 82 were amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 79, which was objected to. Claim 79 was cancelled.

3. Claims 135-140


Claim 135 was amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 136-139, which were objected to. Claim 138 was amended; claims 136, 137 and 139 were cancelled.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been added with the preceding amendments. It is submitted that the application is in suitable condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested. If prosecution of this application may be facilitated through a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 14, 2004

By:  42,199
Daniel E. Vaughan (Registration No.)

Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
702 Marshall Street, Suite 310
Redwood City, CA 94063
(650) 474-1973: voice
(650) 474-1976: facsimile